arXiv:0906.0044v2 [math.AP] 4 Sep 2009

ONE REMARK ON BARELY $\dot{H}^{s_p}$ SUPERCRITICAL WAVE EQUATIONS

TRISTAN ROY

ABSTRACT. We prove that a good $\dot{H}^{s_p}$ critical theory for the $3D$ wave equation $\partial_{tt}u - \triangle u = -|u|^{p-1}u$ can be extended to prove global well-posedness of smooth solutions of at least one $3D$ barely $\dot{H}^{s_p}$ supercritical wave equation $\partial_{tt}u - \triangle u = -|u|^{p-1}ug(|u|)$, with g growing slowly to infinity, provided that a Kenig-Merle type condition is satisfied. This result extends those [26, 18] obtained for the particular case $s_p = 1$.

1. INTRODUCTION

We shall consider the following wave equation

$$\begin{cases} \partial_{tt}u - \triangle u & = -|u|^{p-1}ug\left(|u|\right) \\ u(0) & := u_0 \in \tilde{H}^2 \\ \partial_t u(0) & := u_1 \in \tilde{H}^1 \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

where $u : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is a complex-valued scalar field, $p > 3$, $\tilde{H}^2 := \dot{H}^2(\mathbb{R}^3) \cap \dot{H}^{s_p}(\mathbb{R}^3)$, $\tilde{H}^1 := \dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^3) \cap \dot{H}^{s_p-1}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ and g is a smooth, real-valued positive function defined on the set of nonnegative numbers and satisfying

$$0 \leq \quad g^{'}(x) \quad \lesssim \frac{1}{x} \tag{1.2}$$

Condition (1.2) basically says that g grows more slowly than any positive power of u.

We shall see that this equation (1.1) has many connections with the defocusing power-type defocusing wave equation

$$\begin{cases} \partial_{tt}u - \triangle u & = -|u|^{p-1}u \\ u(0) & := u_0 \in \dot{H}^{s_p}(\mathbb{R}^3) \\ \partial_t u(0) & := u_1 \in \dot{H}^{s_p-1}(\mathbb{R}^3) \end{cases} \tag{1.3}$$

Here $s_p := \frac{3}{2} - \frac{2}{p-1}$. It is known that if u satisfies (1.3) then u_λ defined by

$$u_\lambda(t,x) \quad := \frac{1}{\lambda^{\frac{2}{p-1}}} u\left(\frac{t}{\lambda}, \, \frac{x}{\lambda}\right) \tag{1.4}$$

satisfies the same equation, but with data $u_{\lambda}(0,x) = \frac{1}{\lambda^{\frac{2}{p-1}}} u_0 \left(\frac{x}{\lambda} \right)$ and $\partial_t u_{\lambda}(0,x) = \frac{1}{\lambda^{\frac{2}{p-1}+1}} u_1 \left(\frac{x}{\lambda} \right)$. Notice that (1.3) is $\dot{H}^{s_p}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ critical, which means that the $\dot{H}^{s_p}(\mathbb{R}^3) \times \dot{H}^{s_p-1}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ norm of $(u(0), \partial_t u(0))$ is invariant under the scaling defined above.

We recall the local existence theory: it is known (see for example [11, 22]) that there exists a positive constant $\delta := \delta \left(\|(u_0,u_1)\|_{\dot{H}^{s_p}(\mathbb{R}^3) \times \dot{H}^{s_p-1}(\mathbb{R}^3)} \right) > 0$, a time of local existence $T_l > 0$ such that if

$$\| \cos(tD) u_0 + \frac{\sin(tD)}{D} \|_{L_t^{2(p-1)} L_x^{2(p-1)}([0,T_l] \times \mathbb{R}^3)} \leq \delta \tag{1.5}$$

then there exists a unique solution $(u, \partial_t u) \in \mathcal{C} \left([0,T_l],\, \dot{H}^{s_p}(\mathbb{R}^3) \right) \cap L_t^{2(p-1)} L_x^{2(p-1)}([0,T_l] \times \mathbb{R}^3) \cap D^{\frac{1}{2}-s_p} L_t^4 L_x^4([0,T_l] \times \mathbb{R}^3) \times \mathcal{C} \left([0,T_l],\, \dot{H}^{s_p-1}(\mathbb{R}^3) \right)$ of (1.3) [1] in the sense of the integral equation, i.e u satisfies the Duhamel formula

$$u(t) \quad := \cos(tD) u_0 + \frac{\sin(tD)}{D} u_1 - \int_0^t \frac{\sin(t-t')D}{D} \left(|u|^{p-1} u \right)(t')\, dt' \tag{1.6}$$

It follows that we can define a maximal time interval of existence $I_{max} = (-T_-, T_+)$. Moreover $\|u\|_{L_t^{2(p-1)} L_x^{2(p-1)}(J)} < \infty$, $\|D^{s_p - \frac{1}{2}} u\|_{L_t^4 L_x^4(J)} < \infty$ and $\|(u, \partial_t u)\|_{L_t^{\infty} \dot{H}^{s_p} \times L_t^{\infty} \dot{H}^{s_p-1}(J)} < \infty$ for all subinterval $J \subset I_{max}$. See [12] or [25] for more explanations.

Now we turn to the global well-posedness theory of (1.3). In view of the local well-posedness theory, one can prove (see [11] and references), after some effort, that it is enough to find a finite upper bound of $\|u\|_{L_t^{2(p-1)} L_x^{2(p-1)}(I \times \mathbb{R}^3)}$ on arbitrary long time intervals I, and, if this is the case, then the solution scatters to a solution of the linear wave equation. No blow-up has been observed for (1.3). Therefore it is believed that the following scattering conjecture is true

Conjecture 1. *"**Scattering Conjecture**" Assume that u is the solution of (1.3) with data $(u_0,u_1) \in \dot{H}^{s_p}(\mathbb{R}^3) \times \dot{H}^{s_p-1}(\mathbb{R}^3)$. Then u exists for all time t and there exists $C_1 := C_1 \left(\|(u_0,u_1)\|_{\dot{H}^{s_p}(\mathbb{R}^3) \times \dot{H}^{s_p-1}(\mathbb{R}^3)} \right)$ such that*

$$\|u\|_{L_t^{2(p-1)} L_x^{2(p-1)}(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^3)} \leq C_1 \tag{1.7}$$

The case $s_p = 1$ (or, equivalently, $p = 5$) is particular. Indeed the solution $(u, \partial_t u) \in \mathcal{C} \left([0,T_l],\, \dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^3) \right) \times \mathcal{C} \left([0,T_l],\, L^2(\mathbb{R}^3) \right)$ satisfies the conservation of the energy $E(t)$ defined by

$$E(t) \quad := \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\partial_t u(t,x)|^2 \, dx + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nabla u(t,x)|^2 \, dx + \frac{1}{6} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |u|^6(t,x) \, dx \tag{1.8}$$

In other words, $E(t) = E(0)$. This is why this equation is often called energy-critical: the exponent $s_p = 1$ precisely corresponds to the minimal regularity required for (1.8) to be satisfied. The global well-posedness of (1.8) in the energy class and in higher regularity spaces is now understood. Rauch [17] proved the global existence of smooth solutions of this equation with small data. Struwe [23] showed that the result still holds for large data but with the additional assumption of spherical symmetry of the data. The general case (large data, no symmetry assumption) was finally settled by Grillakis [7, 8]. Later Shatah and Struwe [20] reproved this result. Kapitanski [9] and, independently, Shatah and Struwe [21], proved global existence of solutions in the energy class. Bahouri and Gerard [1] reproved this result by using a compactness method. In particular, they showed that the $L_t^{2(5-1)} L_x^{2(5-1)}(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^3)$ norm of the solution is bounded by an unspecified finite quantity. Lately Tao [24] found an exponential tower type bound of this norm. Notice that, in all these proofs of global existence of solutions of the energy-critical wave equation, the conservation of energy, which leads, in particular, to the control of the $\dot{H}^1 \times L^2$ norm of the solution $(\partial_t u(t), u(t))$, is a key point.

---

[1] Notice that the $L_t^{2(p-1)} L_x^{2(p-1)}(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^3)$ norm of u is invariant under the scaling (1.4). The choice of the space $L_t^{2(p-1)} L_x^{2(p-1)}$ in which we place the solution u is not unique. There exists un infinite number of spaces of the form $L_t^q L_x^r$ scale invariant in which we can establish a local well-posedness theory

If $s_p < 1$, or equivalently, $p < 5$, then we are in the energy-subcritical equation. The scattering conjecture is an open problem. Nevertheless, some partial results are known if we consider the same problem (1.3), but with data $(u_0, u_1) \in H^s \times H^{s-1}$, $s_p < s$. More precisely, it is proved in [14, 19] that there exists $s_0 := s_0(p)$ such that $s_p < s_0 < 1$ and such that (1.3) is globally well-posed in $H^s \times H^{s-1}$, for $s > s_0$. These results rely upon two well-known strategies: the Fourier truncation method [14], designed by Bourgain [2, 3], and the I-method [19], designed by Colliander-Keel-Staffilani-Takaoka-Tao [5].

If $s_p > 1$, or, equivalently, $p > 5$, then we are in the energy-supercritical regime. The global behaviour of the solution is, in this regime, very poorly understood. Indeed, if we follow the theory of the energy-critical wave equation, then the first step would be to prove that the $\dot{H}^{s_p} \times \dot{H}^{s_p - 1}$ norm of the solution is bounded for all time by a finite quantity that would only depend on the $\dot{H}^{s_p} \times \dot{H}^{s_p-1}$ norm of the initial data. Unfortunately, the control of this norm is known to be a very challenging problem, since there are not known conservation laws in high regularity Sobolev spaces. Lately Kenig and Merle [11] proved, at least for radial data, that this step would be the last, by using their concentration compactness/rigidity theorem method [12]. More precisely, they showed that if $\sup_{t \in I_{max}} \|(u(t), \partial_t u(t))\|_{\dot{H}^{s_p}(\mathbb{R}^3) \times \dot{H}^{s_p-1}(\mathbb{R}^3)} < \infty$, then Conjecture 1 is true. See also the recent work of Killip-Visan [15], which establishes results in this direction for the Schrödinger equation.

As mentioned before, the energy supercritical regime is almost *terra incognita*. Nevertheless, Tao [26] observed that the technology used to prove global well-posedness of smooth solutions of (1.3) can be extended, after some effort, to some equations of the type (1.1), with $p = 5$ and radial data. More precisely, he proved global regularity of (1.1) with $g(x) := \log(2 + x^2)$. This phenomenon, in fact, does not depend on the symmetry of the data: it was proved in [18] that there exists a unique global smooth solution of (1.1) with $g(x) := \log^c \log(10 + x^2)$ and $0 < c < \frac{8}{225}$.

Equations of the type (1.1) are called barely $\dot{H}^{s_p}$-supercritical wave equations. Indeed, Condition (1.2) basically says that for every $\epsilon > 0$, there exist two constants $c_1 := c_1(p)$ and $c_2 := c_2(p, \epsilon)$ such that for $|u|$ large

$$c_1(p) \leq g(|u|) \leq c_2(p, \epsilon)|u|^{\epsilon} \tag{1.9}$$

Since the critical exponent of the equation $\partial_{tt} u - \triangle u = -|u|^{p-1+\epsilon} u$ is $s_{p+\epsilon} = s_p + O(\epsilon)$, the nonlinearity of (1.1) is barely $\dot{H}^{s_p}$ supercritical.

The goal of this paper is to check that this phenomenon, observed for $s_p = 1$, still holds for other values of s_p. The standard local well-posedness theory shows us that it is enough to control the pointwise-in-time $\tilde{H}^2 \times \tilde{H}^1$ norm of the solution. In this paper, we will use an alternative local well-posedness theory. We shall prove the following proposition

Proposition 1. *"**Local Existence for barely $\dot{H}^{s_p}$ supercritical wave equation**" Assume that g satisfies (1.2) and*

$$g^{''}(x) \quad = O\left(\tfrac{1}{x^2}\right) \tag{1.10}$$

Let M be such that $\|(u_0,\ u_1)\|_{\tilde{H}^2 \times \tilde{H}^1} \leq M$. Then there exists $\delta := \delta(M) > 0$ small such that if T_l satisfies

$$\| \cos{(tD)} u_0 + \tfrac{\sin tD}{D} u_1 \|_{L_t^{2(p-1)} L_x^{2(p-1)} ([0,T_l] \times \mathbb{R}^3)} \leq \delta \tag{1.11}$$

then there exists a unique $(u, \partial_t u) \in \mathcal{C}\left([0,\ T_l],\ \tilde{H}^2\right) \cap L_t^{2(p-1)} L_x^{2(p-1)} ([0,\ T_l]) \cap D^{\frac{1}{2}-s_p} L_t^4 L_x^4 ([0,\ T_l]) \cap D^{\frac{1}{2}-2} L_t^4 L_x^4 ([0,\ T_l]) \times \mathcal{C}\left([0,\ T_l],\ \tilde{H}^1\right)$ of (1.1) in the sense of the integral equation, i.e u satisfies the following Duhamel formula:

$$u(t) \quad := \cos{(tD)} u_0 + \tfrac{\sin tD}{D} u_1 - \int_0^t \tfrac{\sin(t-t^{'})D}{D} \left(|u(t^{'})|^{p-1} u(t^{'}) g(|u(t^{'})|) \right) dt^{'} \tag{1.12}$$

Notice that there are many similarities between Proposition 1 and the local well-posedness theory for (1.3).

This allows to define a maximum time interval of existence $I_{max,g} = [-T_{-,g},\ T_{+,g}]$ such that for all $J \subset I_{max,g}$, we have $\|u\|_{L_t^{2(p-1)} L_x^{2(p-1)}(J)} < \infty$, $\|D^{s_p - \frac{1}{2}} u\|_{W(J)} < \infty$, $\|D^{2-\frac{1}{2}} u\|_{W(J)} < \infty$ and $\|(u, \partial_t u)\|_{L_t^\infty \tilde{H}^2(J) \times L_t^\infty \tilde{H}^1(J)} < \infty$. Again, see [12] or [25] for more explanations.

Now we set up the problem. In view of the comments above for $s_p = 1$, we need to make two assumptions. First we will work with a "good$''$ $\dot{H}^{s_p}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ theory: therefore we will assume that Conjecture 1 is true. Then, we also would like to work with $\dot{H}^{s_p}(\mathbb{R}^3) \times \dot{H}^{s_p - 1}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ bounded solutions $(u(t), \partial_t u(t))$; more precisely we will assume that the following Kenig-Merle type condition holds

Condition 1.1. *"**Kenig-Merle type condition**" Let g be a function that satisfies (1.2) and that is constant for x large. Then there exists $C_2 := C_2 \left(\|(u_0,\ u_1)\|_{\tilde{H}^2 \times \tilde{H}^1},\ g \right)$ such that*

$$\sup_{t \in I_{max,g}} \| \left(u(t), \partial_t u(t) \right) \|_{\dot{H}^{s_p}(\mathbb{R}^3) \times \dot{H}^{s_p - 1}(\mathbb{R}^3)} \quad \leq C_2 \tag{1.13}$$

Remark 1.2. *In the particular case $s_p = 1$, it is not difficult to see that Condition 1.1 is satisfied. Indeed u satisfies the energy conservation law*

$$E_b(t) := \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \left(\partial_t u(t,x)\right)^2 \, dx + \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nabla u(t,x)|^2 \, dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} F(u(t,x), \bar{u}(t,x)) \, dx \tag{1.14}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} F(z,\bar{z}) &= |z|^{5+1} \int_0^1 t^5 \, \Re \left(g(t|z|)\right) \, dt \\ &= |z|^{5+1} \int_0^1 t^5 \, g(t|z|) \, dt \end{aligned} \tag{1.15}$$

Since g is bounded then $|F(z,\bar{z})| \lesssim |z|^6$. By using the Sobolev embeddings $\|u_0\|_{L_x^6} \lesssim \|u_0\|_{\tilde{H}^2}$ and $\|u(t)\|_{L_x^6} \lesssim \|u(t)\|_{\tilde{H}^2}$, we easily conclude that Condition 1.1 holds. The energy conservation law was constantly used in [26, 18].

The main result of this paper is

Theorem 1.3. *There exists a function $\tilde{g}$ satisfying (1.2) and such that*

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{g}(x) = \infty \tag{1.16}$$

such that the solution of (1.1) (with $g := \tilde{g}$) exists for all time, provided that the scattering conjecture and the Kenig-Merle type condition are satisfied. Moreover there exists a function f depending on T and $\|(u_0,u_1)\|_{\tilde{H}^2 \times \tilde{H}^1}$ such that

$$\|u\|_{L_t^\infty \tilde{H}^2([-T,T])} + \|\partial_t u\|_{L_t^\infty \tilde{H}^1([-T,T])} \leq f\left(T, \|(u_0,u_1)\|_{\tilde{H}^2 \times \tilde{H}^1}\right) \tag{1.17}$$

Theorem 1.3 shows that a "good" $\dot{H}^{s_p}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ theory for (1.3) can be extended, at least, to one barely $\dot{H}^{s_p}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ supercritical equation, with $\tilde{g}$ going to infinity.

Remark 1.4.

- *$\tilde{g}$ is "universal": it does not depend on an upper bound of the initial data*
- *$\tilde{g}$ is unbounded: it goes to infinity as x goes to infinity*

Remark 1.5. *In fact, Theorem 1.3 also holds for a weaker version of Condition 1.1: there exists a function C_2 such that for all subinterval $I \subset I_{max,g}$*

$$\sup_{t \in I} \|(u(t), \partial_t u(t))\|_{\dot{H}^{s_p}(\mathbb{R}^3) \times \dot{H}^{s_p-1}(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq C_2 \tag{1.18}$$

with $C_2 := C_2\left(\|(u_0,u_1)\|_{\tilde{H}^2 \times \tilde{H}^1}, \, g, \, |I|\right)$. See the proof of Theorem 1.3 and, in particular, (5.21), (5.33) and (5.48).

We recall some basic properties and estimates. If $t_0 \in [t_1, t_2]$, if $F \in L_t^{\tilde{q}} L_x^{\tilde{r}}([t_1, \, t_2])$ and if $(u, \partial_t u) \in C\left([t_1, t_2], \, \dot{H}^m(\mathbb{R}^3)\right) \times C\left([t_1, t_2], \, \dot{H}^{m-1}(\mathbb{R}^3)\right)$ satisfy

$$u(t) \; : \cos{(tD)} u_0 + \frac{\sin tD}{D} u_1 - \int_{t_0}^{t} \frac{\sin{(t-t^{'})D}}{D} F(t^{'}) \, dt^{'} \tag{1.19}$$

with data $(u(t_0), \partial_t u(t_0)) \in \dot{H}^m(\mathbb{R}^3) \times \dot{H}^{m-1}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ then we have the Strichartz estimates [6, 16]

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_{L_t^q L_x^r([t_1, \, t_2])} + \|u\|_{L_t^\infty \dot{H}^m(\mathbb{R}^3)([t_1, \, t_2])} + \|\partial_t u\|_{L_t^\infty \dot{H}^{m-1}(\mathbb{R}^3)([t_1, \, t_2])} &\lesssim \|(u(t_0), \, \partial_t u(t_0))\|_{\dot{H}^m(\mathbb{R}^3) \times \dot{H}^{m-1}(\mathbb{R}^3)} \\ &\quad + \|F\|_{L_t^{\tilde{q}} L_x^{\tilde{r}}([t_1, \, t_2])} \end{aligned} \tag{1.20}$$

Here

- (q,r) is m- wave admissible, i.e

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} (q,r) \in (2,\infty] \times [2,\infty] \\ \frac{1}{q} + \frac{3}{r} = \frac{3}{2} - m \end{array} \right. \tag{1.21}$$

-

$$\frac{1}{q} + \frac{3}{r} = \frac{1}{\tilde{q}} + \frac{3}{\tilde{r}} - 2 \tag{1.22}$$

We set some notation that appear throughout the paper.

We write $A \lesssim B$ if there exists a universal nonnegative constant $C^{'} > 0$ such that $A \leq C^{'} B$. $A = O(B)$ means $A \lesssim B$. More generally we write $A \lesssim_{a_1,...,a_n} B$ if there exists a nonnegative constant $C^{'} = C(a_1,...,a_n)$ such that $A \leq C^{'} B$. We say that $C^{''}$ is the constant determined by $\lesssim$ in $A \lesssim_{a_1,...,a_n} B$ if $C^{''}$ is the smallest constant among the $C^{'}$ s such that $A \leq C^{'} B$. We write $A <<_{a_1,..,a_n} B$ if there exists a universal nonnegative small constant $c = c(a_1,...,a_n)$ such that $A \leq cB$. Following [11], we define, on an interval I

$$\begin{array}{ll} \|u\|_{S(I)} & := \|u\|_{L_t^{2(p-1)} L_x^{2(p-1)}(I)} \\ \|u\|_{W(I)} & := \|u\|_{L_t^4 L_x^4(I)} \\ \|u\|_{\tilde{W}(I)} & := \|u\|_{L_t^{\frac{4}{3}} L_x^{\frac{4}{3}}(I)} \end{array} \tag{1.23}$$

We also define the following quantity

$$Q(I,u) \quad := \|D^{s_p - \frac{1}{2}} u\|_{W(I)} + \|D^{2-\frac{1}{2}} u\|_{W(I)} + \|u\|_{L_t^\infty \tilde{H}^2(I)} + \|\partial_t u\|_{L_t^\infty \tilde{H}^1(I)} \tag{1.24}$$

Let X be a Banach space and $r \geq 0$. Then

$$\mathbf{B}(X,r) \quad := \{ f \in X,\ \|f\|_X \leq r \} \tag{1.25}$$

We recall also the well-known Sobolev embeddings. We have

$$\|h\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)} \quad \lesssim \|h\|_{\tilde{H}^2} \tag{1.26}$$

and

$$\|h\|_{S(I)} \quad \lesssim \|D^{s_p - \frac{1}{2}} h\|_{L_t^{2(p-1)} L_x^{\frac{6(p-1)}{2p-3}}(I)} \tag{1.27}$$

We shall combine (1.27) with the Strichartz estimates, since $\left(2(p-1),\, \frac{6(p-1)}{2p-3}\right)$ is $\frac{1}{2}$- wave admissible.

We also recall some Leibnitz rules [4, 13]. We have

$$\|D^\alpha F(u)\|_{L_t^q L_x^r(I)} \quad \lesssim \|F^{'}(u)\|_{L_t^{q_1} L_x^{r_1}(I)} \|D^\alpha u\|_{L_t^{q_2} L_x^{r_2}(I)} \tag{1.28}$$

with $\alpha > 0$, r, r_1, r_2 lying in $[1,\, \infty]$, $\frac{1}{q} = \frac{1}{q_1} + \frac{1}{q_2}$ and $\frac{1}{r} = \frac{1}{r_1} + \frac{1}{r_2}$.

The Leibnitz rule for products is

$$\|D^{\alpha}(uv)\|_{L_t^q L_x^r(I)} \lesssim \|D^{\alpha}u\|_{L_t^{q_1} L_x^{r_1}(I)} \|v\|_{L_t^{q_2} L_x^{r_2}(I)} + \|D^{\alpha}u\|_{L_t^{q_3} L_x^{r_3}(I)} \|v\|_{L_t^{q_4} L_x^{r_4}(I)} \tag{1.29}$$

with $\alpha > 0$, r, r_1, r_2 lying in $[1, \infty]$, $\frac{1}{q} = \frac{1}{q_1} + \frac{1}{q_2}$, $\frac{1}{q} = \frac{1}{q_3} + \frac{1}{q_4}$, $\frac{1}{r} = \frac{1}{r_1} + \frac{1}{r_2}$ and $\frac{1}{r} = \frac{1}{r_3} + \frac{1}{r_4}$.

If $F \in C^2$ then we can write

$$F(x) - F(y) = \int_0^1 F^{'}(tx + (1-t)y) \,.(x-y)\, dt \tag{1.30}$$

By using (1.28) and (1.29) the Leibnitz rule for differences can be formulated as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \|D^{\alpha}(F(u) - F(v))\|_{L_t^q L_x^r(I)} & \lesssim \sup_{t \in [0,1]} \|F^{'}(tu + (1-t)v)\|_{L_t^{q_1} L_x^{r_1}(I)} \|D^{\alpha}(u-v)\|_{L_t^{q_2} L_x^{r_2}(I)} \\ & + \sup_{t \in [0,1]} \|F^{''}(tu + (1-t)v)\|_{L_t^{q_1^{'}} L_x^{r_1^{'}}(I)} \left(\|D^{\alpha}u\|_{L_t^{q_2^{'}} L_x^{r_2^{'}}(I)} + \|D^{\alpha}v\|_{L_t^{q_2^{'}} L_x^{r_2^{'}}(I)} \right) \\ & \|u-v\|_{L_t^{q_3^{'}} L_x^{r_3^{'}}(I)} \end{aligned} \tag{1.31}$$

with $\alpha > 0, r_1, r_2, r_1^{'}, r_2^{'}, r_3^{'}$ lying in $[1, \infty]$, $\frac{1}{q} = \frac{1}{q_1} + \frac{1}{q_2}$, $\frac{1}{r} = \frac{1}{r_1} + \frac{1}{r_2}$, $\frac{1}{q} = \frac{1}{q_1^{'}} + \frac{1}{q_2^{'}} + \frac{1}{q_3^{'}}$ and $\frac{1}{r} = \frac{1}{r_1^{'}} + \frac{1}{r_2^{'}} + \frac{1}{r_3^{'}}$.

We shall apply these formulas to several formulas of $F(u)$, and, in particular, to $F(u) := |u|^{p-1} u g(|u|)$. Notice that, by (1.2) and (1.10), we have $F^{'}(x) \sim |x|^{p-1} g(|x|)$ and $F^{''}(x) \sim |x|^{p-2} g(|x|)$. Notice also that, by (1.2) again, we have, for $t \in [0,1]$

$$\begin{aligned} g\left(|tx + (1-t)y|\right) & \leq g\left(2 \max\left(|x|, |y|\right)\right) \\ & \leq g(\max\left(|x|, |y|\right) + \log 2 \\ & \lesssim g(|x|) + g(|y|) \end{aligned} \tag{1.32}$$

This will allow us to estimate easily $\sup_{t \in [0,1]} \|F^{'}(tu + (1-t)v)\|_{L_t^{q_1} L_x^{r_1}(I)}$ and $\sup_{t \in [0,1]} \|F^{''}(tu + (1-t)v)\|_{L_t^{q_1} L_x^{r_1}(I)}$.

Now we explain the main ideas of this paper. We shall prove, in Section 3, that for a large number of g s, a special property for the solution of (1.1) holds

Proposition 2. ***"control of $S(I)$-norm and control of norm of initial data imply control of $L_t^{\infty} \tilde{H}^2(I) \times L_t^{\infty} \tilde{H}^1(I)$ norm"*** *Let $I \subset I_{max,g}$ and $a \in I$. Assume that g satisfies (1.2), (1.10) and* [2]

$$\int_1^{\infty} \frac{1}{y g^2(y)}\, dy = \infty \tag{1.33}$$

Let $A \geq 0$ such that $\|(u_0, u_1)\|_{\tilde{H}^2 \times \tilde{H}^1} \leq A$. Let u be the solution of (1.1). There exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\|(u, \partial_t u)\|_{L_t^{\infty} \tilde{H}^2(I) \times L_t^{\infty} \tilde{H}^1(I)} \leq (2C)^N A \tag{1.34}$$

---

[2] Condition (1.33) basically says that g grows slowly on average.

with $N := N(I)$ such that

$$\int_{2CA}^{(2C)^N A} \frac{1}{yg^2(y)}\, dy >> \|u\|_{S(I)}^{2(p-1)} \tag{1.35}$$

Moreover we shall give a criterion of global well-posedness (proved in Section 4)

Proposition 3. ***"criterion of global well-posedness"*** *Assume that $|I_{max,g}| < \infty$. Assume that g satisfies (1.2), (1.10) and (1.33). Then*

$$\|u\|_{S(I_{max,g})} = \infty \tag{1.36}$$

The first step would be to prove global well-posedness of (1.1), with g_1 a non decreasing function that is constant for x large (say $x \geq C_1^{'}$, with $C_1^{'}$ to be determined). By Proposition 3, it is enough to find an upper bound of the $S([-T,T])$ norm of the solution $u_{[1]}$ for T arbitrary large. This is indeed possible, by proving that g_1 can be considered as a subcritical perturbation of the nonlinearity. In other words, $g_1(|u|)|u|^{p-1}u$ will play the same role as that of $|u|^{p-1}u\left(1 - \frac{1}{|u|^{\alpha}}\right)$ for some $\alpha > 0$. Once we have noticed that this comparison is possible, we shall estimate the relevant norms (and, in particular $\|u_{[1]}\|_{S([-T,T])}$)) by using perturbation theory, Conjecture 1 and Condition 1.1, in the same spirit as Zhang [27]. We expect to find a bound of the form

$$\|u_{[1]}\|_{S([-T,T])} \leq C_3\left(\|(u_0,u_1)\|_{\tilde{H}^2 \times \tilde{H}^1}, T\right) \tag{1.37}$$

with C_3 increasing as T or $\|(u_0,u_1)\|_{\tilde{H}^2 \times \tilde{H}^1}$ grows. Notice that if we restrict $[-T,T]$ to the interval $[-1,1]$ and if the $\tilde{H}^2 \times \tilde{H}^1$ norm of the initial data (u_0,u_1) is bounded by one, then we can prove, by (1.37), (1.26) and Proposition 2, that the $L_t^{\infty}L_x^{\infty}([-T,T])$ norm of the solution $u_{[1]}$ is bounded by a constant (denoted by C_1) on $[-1,1]$. Therefore, if h is a smooth extension of g_1 outside $[0,C_1]$, and if u is the solution of (1.1) (with $g := h$) then we expect to prove that $u = u_{[1]}$ on $[-1,1]$ and for data $\|(u_0,u_1)\|_{\tilde{H}^2 \times \tilde{H}^1} \leq 1$. This implies in particular, by (1.37), that we have a finite upper bound $\|u\|_{S([-1,1])}$. We are not done yet. There are two problems. First g_1 does not go to infinity. Second we only control $\|u\|_{S([-1,1])}$ for data $\|(u_0,u_1)\|_{\tilde{H}^2 \times \tilde{H}^1} \leq 1$: we would like to control $\|u\|_{S(\mathbb{R})}$ for arbitrary data. In order to overcome these difficulties we iterate the procedure described above. More precisely, given a function g_{i-1} that is constant for $x \geq C_{i-1}$ and such that $u_{[i-1]}$, solution of (1.1) with $g = g_{i-1}$, satisfies $\|u_{[i-1]}\|_{S([-(i-1),i-1])} < \infty$, we construct a function g_i that satisfies the following properties

- it is an extension of g_{i-1} outside $[0, C_{i-1}]$
- it is increasing and constant (say equal to $i+1$) for $x \geq C_i^{'}$, with $C_i^{'}$ to be determined

Again, we shall prove that g_i may be regarded as a subcritical perturbation of the nonlinearity $(i+1)|u|^{p-1}u$. This allow us to control $\|u_{[i]}\|_{S([-i,i])}$, by using perturbation theory, Conjecture 1 and Condition 1.1. By using Proposition 2 and (1.26), we can find a finite upper bound of $\|u_{[i]}\|_{L_t^{\infty}L_x^{\infty}([-i,i])}$. We assign the value of this upper bound to C_i. To conclude the argument we let $\tilde{g} = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} g_i$. Given

$T > 0$, we can find a j such that $[-T, T] \subset [-j, j]$ and $\|(u_0, u_1)\|_{\tilde{H}^2 \times \tilde{H}^1} \leq j$. We prove that $u = u_{[j]}$ on $[-j, j]$ with u, solution of (1.1) with $g := \tilde{g}$. Since we have a finite upper bound of $\|u_{[j]}\|_{S([-j,j])}$, we also control $\|u\|_{S([-j,j])}$ and $\|u\|_{S([-T,T])}$. Theorem 1.3 follows from Proposition 3.

Acknowledgements : The author would like to thank Terence Tao for suggesting this problem and for valuable discussions related to this work.

2. Proof of Proposition 1

In this section we prove Proposition 1 for barely $\dot{H}^{s_p}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ supercritical wave equations (1.1). The proof is based upon standard arguments. Here we have chosen to modify an argument in [11].

For δ, T_l, C, M to be chosen and such that (1.11) holds we define

$$\begin{aligned} B_1 &:= \mathbf{B}\left(\mathcal{C}([0, T_l],\, \tilde{H}^2) \cap D^{\frac{1}{2}-s_p} W([0, T_l]) \cap D^{\frac{1}{2}-2} W([0, T_l]), 2CM\right) \\ B_2 &:= \mathbf{B}\left(S([0, T_l]),\, 2\delta\right) \\ B^{'} &:= \mathbf{B}\left(\mathcal{C}([0, T_l],\, \tilde{H}^1), 2CM\right) \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

and

$$X := \left\{(u, \partial_t u) :\, u \in B_1 \cap B_2,\, \partial_t u \in B^{'}\right\} \tag{2.2}$$

Let

(2.3)
$$\Psi(u,\, \partial_t u) := \begin{pmatrix} \cos(tD) u_0 + \frac{\sin(tD)}{D} u_1 - \int_0^t \frac{\sin(t-t^{'})D}{D} \left(|u(t^{'})|^{p-1} u(t^{'}) g(|u(t^{'})|)\right) dt^{'} \\ -D \sin(tD) u_0 + \cos(tD) u_1 - \int_0^t \cos(t-t^{'}) D \left(|u(t^{'})|^{p-1} u(t^{'}) g(|u(t^{'})|)\right) dt^{'} \end{pmatrix}$$

Then

- Ψ maps X to X. Indeed, by (1.11), (1.20) and the fractional Leibnitz rule (1.28) applied to $\alpha \in \left\{s_p - \frac{1}{2},\, 2 - \frac{1}{2}\right\}$ and $F(u) := |u|^{p-1} u g(|u|)$ and by applying the multipliers $D^{2-\frac{1}{2}}$ and $D^{s_p - \frac{1}{2}}$ to the Strichartz estimates with $m = \frac{1}{2}$ we have

  (2.4)
  $$\begin{aligned} Q([0,\, T_l]) &\lesssim \|(u_0,\, u_1)\|_{\tilde{H}^2(\mathbb{R}^3) \times \tilde{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^3)} + \|D^{s_p-\frac{1}{2}}\left(|u|^{p-1} u g(|u|)\right)\|_{\tilde{W}([0,T_l])} \\ &\quad + \|D^{2-\frac{1}{2}}\left(|u|^{p-1} u g(|u|)\right)\|_{\tilde{W}([0,T_l])} \\ &\leq CM + C\left(\|D^{s_p-\frac{1}{2}} u\|_{W([0,T_l])} + \|D^{2-\frac{1}{2}} u\|_{W([0,T_l])}\right) \|u\|^{p-1}_{S([0,T_l])} g(\|u\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^\infty([0,T_l])}) \\ &\leq CM + (2\delta)^{p-1} C (2CM) g(2CM) \end{aligned}$$

  for some $C > 0$ and

  $$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_{S([0,T_l])} - \delta &\lesssim \|D^{s_p-\frac{1}{2}}\left(|u|^{p-1} u g(|u|)\right)\|_{\tilde{W}([0,T_l])} \\ &\lesssim \|u\|^{p-1}_{S([0,T_l])} \|D^{s_p-\frac{1}{2}} u\|_{W([0,T_l])} g(\|u\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^\infty([0,T_l])}) \\ &\lesssim (2\delta)^{p-1} (2CM) g(2CM) \end{aligned} \tag{2.5}$$

Choosing $\delta = \delta(M) > 0$ small enough we see that $\Psi(X) \subset X$.

- Ψ is a contraction. Indeed we get

$$
\begin{array}{l}
\|\Psi(u) - \Psi(v)\|_X \\
\lesssim \left\| D^{s_p - \frac{1}{2}} (|u|^{p-1} u g(|u|) - |v|^{p-1} v g(|v|)) \right\|_{\tilde{W}([0,T_l])} + \left\| D^{2 - \frac{1}{2}} (|u|^{p-1} u g(|u|) - |v|^{p-1} v g(|v|)) \right\|_{\tilde{W}([0,T_l])} \\
\lesssim g(\|u\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^\infty([0,T_l])}) \times \\
\left(\begin{array}{l}
\left(\|u\|^{p-1}_{S([0,T_l])} + \|v\|^{p-1}_{S([0,T_l])} \right) \left(\|D^{s_p - \frac{1}{2}} (u-v)\|_{W([0,T_l])} + \|D^{2-\frac{1}{2}} (u-v)\|_{W([0,T_l])} \right) \\
+ \left(\|u\|^{p-2}_{S([0,T_l])} + \|v\|^{p-2}_{S([0,T_l])} \right) \left(\begin{array}{l} \|D^{s_p - \frac{1}{2}} u\|_{W([0,T_l])} + \|D^{2-\frac{1}{2}} u\|_{W([0,T_l])} + \|D^{s_p - \frac{1}{2}} v\|_{W([0,T_l])} \\ + \|D^{2-\frac{1}{2}} v\|_{W([0,T_l])} \end{array} \right) \\
\|u - v\|_{S([0,T_l])}
\end{array} \right) \\
\lesssim \left(g(2CM)(2\delta)^{p-1} + (2\delta)^{p-2}(2CM) \right) \|u - v\|_X
\end{array}
\tag{2.6}
$$

In the above computations, we applied the Leibnitz rule for differences to $\alpha \in \{s_p - \frac{1}{2}, 2 - \frac{1}{2}\}$ and $F(u) := |u|^{p-1} u g(|u|)$. Therefore, if $\delta = \delta(M) > 0$ is small enough, then Ψ is a contraction.

3. Proof of Proposition 2

In this section we prove Proposition 2.

It is enough to prove that $Q(I) < \infty$. Without loss of generality we can assume that $A >> 1$. Then we divide I into subintervals $(I_i)_{1 \leq i \leq N}$ such that

$$
\|u\|_{S(I_i)} = \frac{\eta}{g^{\frac{1}{p-1}}((2C)^N A)}
\tag{3.1}
$$

for some $C \gtrsim 1$ and $\eta > 0$ constants to be chosen later, except maybe the last one. Notice that such a partition always exists since by (1.33) we get for $N := N(I)$ large enough

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{1}{g^2((2C)^i A)} & \geq \int_1^N \frac{1}{g^2((2C)^x A)} \, dx \\
& \gtrsim \int_{2CA}^{(2C)^N A} \frac{1}{y g^2(y)} \, dy \\
& >> \|u\|^{2(p-1)}_{S(I)}
\end{array}
\tag{3.2}
$$

We get, by a similar token used in Section 2

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
Q(I_1, u) & \lesssim \|(u_0, u_1)\|_{\tilde{H}^2(\mathbb{R}^3) \times \tilde{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^3)} + \left\| D^{s_p - \frac{1}{2}} \left(|u|^{p-1} u g(|u|) \right) \right\|_{\tilde{W}(I_1)} \\
& + \left\| D^{2 - \frac{1}{2}} \left(|u|^{p-1} u g(|u|) \right) \right\|_{\tilde{W}(I_1)} \\
& \lesssim A + \left(\|D^{s_p - \frac{1}{2}} u\|_{W(I_1)} + \|D^{2-\frac{1}{2}} u\|_{W(I_1)} \right) \|u\|^{p-1}_{S(I_1)} g(\|u\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^\infty(I_1)}) \\
& \lesssim A + \|u\|^{p-1}_{S(I_1)} Q(I_1, u) g(Q(I_1, u))
\end{array}
\tag{3.3}
$$

We choose C to be equal to the constant determined by $\lesssim$ in (3.3). Without loss of generality we can assume that $C > 1$. By a continuity argument, iteration on i, we get, for $\eta << 1$, (1.34).

4. Proof of Proposition 3

In this section we prove Proposition 3.

We argue as follows: by time reversal symmetry it is enough to prove that $T_{+,g} < \infty$. If $\|u\|_{S(I_{max,g})} < \infty$ then we have $Q([0, T_{+,g}], u) < \infty$: this follows by slightly adapting the proof of Proposition 2. Consequently, by the dominated convergence theorem, there would exists a sequence $t_n \rightarrow T_{+,g}$ such that $\|u\|_{S([t_n, T_{+,g}])} << \delta$ and $\|D^{s_p - \frac{1}{2}} u\|_{W([t_n, T_{+,g}])} << \delta$ if n is large enough with δ defined in Proposition 1. But, by (1.19) and (1.20)

$$\begin{aligned} & \| \cos((t-t_n)D) u(t_n) + \tfrac{\sin(t-t_n)D}{D} u_1 \|_{S([t_n, T_{+,g}])} \\ & \lesssim \|u\|_{S([t_n, T_{+,g}])} + \|u\|^{p-1}_{S([t_n, T_{+,g}])} \|D^{s_p - \frac{1}{2}} u\|_{W([t_n, T_{+,g}])} g(Q([0, T_{+,g}, u])) \\ & << \delta \end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

and consequently, by continuity, there would exist $\tilde{T} > T_{+,g}$ such that

$$\| \cos((t-t_n)D) u(t_n) + \tfrac{\sin(t-t_n)D}{D} \partial_t u(t_n) \|_{S([t_n, \tilde{T}])} \quad \leq \delta \tag{4.2}$$

, which would contradict the definition of $T_{+,g}$.

Remark 4.1. *Notice that if we have the stronger bound* $\|u\|_{S(I_{max,g})} \leq C$ *with* $C := C\left(\|(u_0, u_1)\|_{\tilde{H}^2 \times \tilde{H}^1}\right) < \infty$, *then not only* $I_{max,g} = (-\infty, +\infty)$ *but also* u *scatters as* $t \rightarrow \pm\infty$. *Indeed by Proposition 3,* $I_{max,g} = \mathbb{R}$. *Then by time reversal symmetry it is enough to assume that* $t \rightarrow \infty$. *Let* $v(t) := (u(t), \partial_t u(t))$. *We are looking for* $v_{+,0} := (u_{+,0},\, u_{+,1})$ *such that*

$$\|v(t) - K(t) v_{+,0}\|_{\tilde{H}^2 \times \tilde{H}^1} \quad \rightarrow 0 \tag{4.3}$$

as $t \rightarrow \infty$. *Here*

$$K(t) \quad := \begin{pmatrix} \cos tD & \frac{\sin tD}{D} \\ -D \sin tD & \cos tD \end{pmatrix} \tag{4.4}$$

We have

$$K^{-1}(t) \quad = \begin{pmatrix} \cos(tD) & -\frac{\sin(tD)}{D} \\ D \sin(tD) & \cos(tD) \end{pmatrix} \tag{4.5}$$

Notice that $K^{-1}(t)$ *and* $K(t)$ *are bounded in* $\tilde{H}^2 \times \tilde{H}^1$. *Therefore it is enough to prove that* $K^{-1}(t) v(t)$ *has a limit as* $t \rightarrow \infty$. *But since* $K^{-1}(t) v(t) = (u_0, u_1) - K^{-1}(t)\,(u_{nl}(t),\, \partial_t u_{nl}(t))$ *(with* u_{nl} *denoting the nonlinear part of the solution (1.12)* [3]*), then it suffices to prove that* $K^{-1}(t)\,(u_{nl}(t), \partial_t u_{nl}(t))$ *has a limit. But*

---

[3] i.e

$$u_{nl}(t) \quad := -\int_0^t \frac{\sin(t-t')D}{D} \left(|u(t')|^{p-1} u(t') g(|u(t')|) \right) dt'$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \| K^{-1}(t_1) u_{nl}(t_1) - K^{-1}(t_2) u_{nl}(t_2) \|_{\tilde{H}^2 \times \tilde{H}^1} \\
& \lesssim \| (u_{nl}, \partial_t u_{nl}) \|_{L_t^\infty \tilde{H}^2([t_1,t_2]) \times L_t^\infty \tilde{H}^1([t_1,t_2])} \\
& \lesssim \left(\| D^{s_p - \frac{1}{2}} (|u|^{p-1} u g(|u|)) \|_{\tilde{W}([t_1,t_2])} + \| D^{2-\frac{1}{2}} (|u|^{p-1} u g(|u|)) \|_{\tilde{W}([t_1,t_2])} \right) \\
& \lesssim \left(\| D^{s_p - \frac{1}{2}} u \|_{W([t_1,t_2])} + \| D^{2-\frac{1}{2}} u \|_{W([t_1,t_2])} \right) \| u \|^{p-1}_{S([t_1,t_2])} g(\| u \|_{L_t^\infty L_x^\infty(\mathbb{R})})
\end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

It remains to prove that $Q(\mathbb{R}) < \infty$ in order to conclude that the Cauchy criterion is satisfied, which would imply scattering. This follows from $\|u\|_{S(\mathbb{R})} < \infty$ and a slight modification of the proof of Proposition 2.

5. CONSTRUCTION OF THE FUNCTION $\tilde{g}$

In this section we prove Theorem 1.3. Let

$$Up\,(i) := \left\{ (T,\, (u_0, u_1)) :\, 0 \leq T \leq i,\, \| (u_0, u_1) \|_{\tilde{H}^2 \times \tilde{H}^1} \leq i \right\} \tag{5.1}$$

As i ranges over $\{1, 2, ...\}$ we construct, for each set $Up\,(i)$, a function g_i satisfying (1.2) and (1.10). Moreover it is constant for large values of $|x|$. The function g_{i+1} depends on g_i; the construction of g_i is made by induction on i. More precisely we will prove that the following lemma

Lemma 4. *Let $A >> 1$. Then there exist two sequences of numbers $\{C_i\}_{i \geq 0}$, $\{C_i^{'}\}_{i \geq 0}$ and a sequence of functions $\{g_i\}_{i \geq 0}$ such that for all $(T,\, (u_0, u_1)) \in Up\,(i)$*

- *$g_0 := 1$, $C_0 := 0$ and $C_0^{'} = 0$*
- *$\{C_i\}_{i \geq 0}$ and $\{C_i^{'}\}_{i \geq 0}$ are positive, non decreasing. Moreover they satisfy*

$$A C_{i-1} < C_i^{'} < A C_i \tag{5.2}$$

  for $i \geq 1$ and

$$C_i \quad \geq i \tag{5.3}$$

- *g_i is smooth, non decreasing; it satisfies (1.2), (1.10),*

$$\int_1^{C_i^{'}} \frac{1}{t g_i^2(t)} \, dt \quad \rightarrow_{i \rightarrow \infty} \infty \tag{5.4}$$

  and

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{ll} g_i(|x|) & = g_{i-1}(|x|),\, |x| \leq A C_{i-1} \\ g_i(|x|) & = i+1,\, |x| \geq C_i^{'} \end{array} \right. \tag{5.5}$$

- *the solution $u_{[i]}$ of the following wave equation*

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \partial_{tt} u_{[i]} - \triangle u_{[i]} & = -|u_{[i]}|^{p-1} u_{[i]} g_i \left(|u_{[i]}| \right) \\ u_{[i]}(0) & = u_0 \in \tilde{H}^2 \\ \partial_t u_{[i]}(0) & = u_1 \in \tilde{H}^1 \end{array} \right. \tag{5.6}$$

satisfies

$$\max\left(\|u_{[i]}\|_{S([-i,i])}, \left\|(u_{[i]}, \partial_t u_{[i]})\right\|_{L_t^\infty \tilde{H}^2([-T,T]) \times L_t^\infty \tilde{H}^1([-T,T])}\right) \leq C_i \tag{5.7}$$

This lemma will be proved in the next subsection. Assuming that is true let $\tilde{g} = \lim_{i \to \infty} g_i$. Then clearly $\tilde{g}$ is smooth; it satisfies (1.2) and (1.10). It also goes to infinity. Moreover let u be the solution of (1.1) with $g := \tilde{g}$. We want to prove that the solution u exists for all time. Let $T_0 \geq 0$ be a fixed time. Let $j := j(T_0, \|u_0\|_{\tilde{H}^2}, \|u_1\|_{\tilde{H}^1}) > 0$ be the smallest positive integer such that $[-T_0, T_0] \subset [-j, j]$ and $\|(u_0, u_1)\|_{\tilde{H}^2 \times \tilde{H}^1} \leq j$. We claim that $\|(u, \partial_t u)\|_{L_t^\infty \tilde{H}^2([-T_0,T_0]) \times L_t^\infty \tilde{H}^1([-T_0,T_0])} \leq C_j$ and $\|u\|_{S([-T_0,T_0])} \leq C_j$. Indeed let

$$F_j := \left\{t \in [0,j],\ \|(u, \partial_t u)\|_{L_t^\infty \tilde{H}^2([-t,t]) \times L_t^\infty \tilde{H}^1([-t,t])} \leq C_j \text{ and } \|u\|_{S([-t,t])} \leq C_j\right\} \tag{5.8}$$

Then

- $F_j \neq \emptyset$: $0 \in F_j$, by (5.3).
- F_j is closed. Indeed let $\tilde{t} \in \overline{F_j}$. Then there exist a sequence $(t_n)_{n \geq 1}$ such that $t_n \in [0,j]$ such that $t_n \to \tilde{t}$, $\|u\|_{S([-t_n,t_n])} \leq C_j$ and $\|(u, \partial_t u)\|_{L_t^\infty \tilde{H}^2([-t_n,t_n]) \times L_t^\infty \tilde{H}^1([-t_n,t_n])} \leq C_j$. It is enough to prove that $\|u\|_{S([-\tilde{t},\tilde{t}])} < \infty$ and then apply dominated convergence. There are two subcases:
  - card$\{t_n,\ t_n \leq \tilde{t}\} < \infty$: in this case, there exists n_0 large enough such that $t_n \geq \tilde{t}$ for $n \geq n_0$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_{S([-\tilde{t},\tilde{t}])} &\leq \|u\|_{S([-t_n,t_n])} \\ &< \infty \end{aligned} \tag{5.9}$$

  - card$\{t_n,\ t_n \leq \tilde{t}\} = \infty$: even if it means passing to a subsequence, we can still assume that $t_n \leq \tilde{t}$. Let $n_0 \geq 1$ be fixed. Then, by the inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \|\cos{(t - t_{n_0})D} u(t_{n_0}) + \tfrac{\sin{(t-t_{n_0})D}}{D} \partial_t u(t_{n_0})\|_{S([t_{n_0},\tilde{t}])} &\lesssim \|(u(t_{n_0}), \partial_t u(t_{n_0}))\|_{\tilde{H}^2 \times \tilde{H}^1} \\ &\lesssim C_j \end{aligned} \tag{5.10}$$

    we conclude from the dominated convergence theorem that there exists $n_1 := n_1(n_0)$ large enough such that

$$\|\cos{(t - t_{n_0})D} u(t_{n_0}) + \tfrac{\sin{(t-t_{n_0})D}}{D} \partial_t u(t_{n_0})\|_{S([t_{n_1},\tilde{t}])} \leq \delta \tag{5.11}$$

    with $\delta := \delta(C_j)$ defined in Proposition 1. Therefore, by Proposition 1, we have $\|u\|_{S([t_{n_1},\tilde{t}])} < \infty$. By a similar token, $\|u\|_{S([-\tilde{t},-t_{n_1}])} < \infty$. Combining these inequalities with $\|u\|_{S([-t_{n_1},t_{n_1}])} \leq C_j$, we eventually get $\|u\|_{S([-\tilde{t},\tilde{t}])} < \infty$.
- F_j is open. Indeed let $\bar{t} \in F_j$. By Proposition 1 there exists $\alpha > 0$ such that if $t \in (\bar{t} - \alpha, \bar{t} + \alpha) \cap [0,j]$ then $[-t,t] \subset I_{max,\tilde{g}}$ and $\|u\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^\infty([-t,t])} \lesssim \|u\|_{L_t^\infty \tilde{H}^2([-t,t])} \lesssim C_j$. Notice also that, by (5.7), $[-t,t] \subset I_{max,g_j}$. In view of these remarks, we conclude, after slightly adapting the proof of Proposition 2, that $Q([-t,t],u) \lesssim_j 1$ and $Q([-t,t],u_{[j]}) \lesssim_j 1$. We divide

$[-t,\, t]$ into a finite number of subintervals $(I_i)_{i \leq k} = ([a_i, b_i])_{1 \leq i \leq k}$ that satisfy, for $\eta << 1$ to be defined later, the following properties hold

(1) $1 \leq i \leq k$: $\|u_{[j]}\|_{S(I_i)} \leq \eta$, $\|u\|_{S(I_i)} \leq \eta$, $\|D^{s_p - \frac{1}{2}} u_{[j]}\|_{W(I_i)} \leq \eta$, $\|D^{2-\frac{1}{2}} u\|_{W(I_i)} \leq \eta$ and $\|D^{2-\frac{1}{2}} u_{[j]}\|_{W(I_i)} \leq \eta$

(2) $1 \leq i < k$: $\|u_{[j]}\|_{S(I_i)} = \eta$ or $\|u\|_{S(I_i)} = \eta$ or $\|D^{s_p-\frac{1}{2}} u_{[j]}\|_{W(I_i)} = \eta$ or $\|D^{2-\frac{1}{2}} u\|_{W(I_i)} = \eta$ or $\|D^{2-\frac{1}{2}} u_{[j]}\|_{W(I_i)} = \eta$

Notice that, by (1.2), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|g_j(|u|) - g_j(|u_{[j]}|)\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^\infty(I_i)} &\lesssim \|u - u_{[j]}\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^\infty(I_i)} \\ &\lesssim \|u - u_{[j]}\|_{L_t^\infty \tilde{H}^2(I_i)} \end{aligned} \tag{5.12}$$

We consider $w = u - u_{[j]}$. By applying the Leibnitz rules (1.28), (1.31) and (1.29), and by (5.12) we have

$$\begin{aligned} Q(I_1, w) \lesssim\; & \left\| D^{s_p - \frac{1}{2}} (|u|^{p-1} u (\tilde{g} - g_j)(|u|)) \right\|_{\tilde{W}(I_1)} + \left\| D^{2-\frac{1}{2}} (|u|^{p-1} u (\tilde{g} - g_j)(|u|)) \right\|_{\tilde{W}(I_1)} \\ & + \left\| D^{s_p - \frac{1}{2}} (|u|^{p-1} u - |u_{[j]}|^{p-1} u_{[j]}) g_j(|u|) \right\|_{\tilde{W}(I_1)} + \\ & \left\| D^{2-\frac{1}{2}} (|u|^{p-1} u - |u_{[j]}|^{p-1} u_{[j]}) g_j(|u|) \right\|_{\tilde{W}(I_1)} \\ & + \left\| D^{s_p - \frac{1}{2}} (|u_{[j]}|^{p-1} u_{[j]} (g_j(|u|) - g_j(|u_{[j]}|))) \right\|_{\tilde{W}(I_1)} + \\ & \left\| D^{2-\frac{1}{2}} (|u_{[j]}|^{p-1} u_{[j]} (g_j(|u|) - g_j(|u_{[j]}|))) \right\|_{\tilde{W}(I_1)} \\ \lesssim\; & (\tilde{g} - g_j)(\|u\|_{L_t^\infty \tilde{H}^2(I_1)}) \left(\|D^{s_p - \frac{1}{2}} u\|_{W(I_1)} + \|D^{2-\frac{1}{2}} u\|_{W(I_1)} \right) \|u\|_{S(I_1)}^{p-1} \\ & + g_j(\|u\|_{L_t^\infty \tilde{H}^2(I_1)}) \left[\begin{array}{l} (\|u_{[j]}\|_{S(I_1)}^{p-1} + \|u\|_{S(I_1)}^{p-1})(\|D^{s_p - \frac{1}{2}} w\|_{W(I_1)} + \|D^{2-\frac{1}{2}} w\|_{W(I_1)}) \\ +(\|u_{[j]}\|_{S(I_1)}^{p-2} + \|u\|_{S(I_1)}^{p-2}) \\ \left(\begin{array}{l} \|D^{s_p - \frac{1}{2}} u\|_{W(I_1)} + \|D^{2-\frac{1}{2}} u\|_{W(I_1)} \\ +\|D^{s_p-\frac{1}{2}} u_{[j]}\|_{W(I_1)} + \|D^{2-\frac{1}{2}} u_{[j]}\|_{W(I_1)} \end{array} \right) \|w\|_{S(I_1)} \end{array} \right] \\ & + \|g_j^{'}(|u|)\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^\infty(I_1)} \left(\|D^{s_p - \frac{1}{2}} u\|_{W(I_1)} + \|D^{2-\frac{1}{2}} u\|_{W(I_1)} \right) (\|u\|_{S(I_1)}^{p-2} + \|u_{[j]}\|_{S(I_1)}^{p-2}) \|w\|_{S(I_1)} \\ & + \left\| g_j(|u|) - g_j(|u_{[j]}|) \right\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^\infty(I_1)} \|D^{s_p - \frac{1}{2}} u_{[j]}\|_{W(I_1)} \|u_{[j]}\|_{S(I_1)}^{p-1} \\ & + \|u_{[j]}\|_{S(I_1)}^{p-1} \|u_{[j]}\|_{L_t^\infty \tilde{H}^2(I_1)} \left(\begin{array}{l} \|w\|_{L_t^\infty \tilde{H}^2(I_1)} \left(\|D^{s_p - \frac{1}{2}} u\|_{W(I_1)} + \|D^{s_p - \frac{1}{2}} u_{[j]}\|_{W(I_1)} \right) \\ +\|D^{s_p - \frac{1}{2}} w\|_{W(I_1)} \end{array} \right) \\ \lesssim\; & g_j(C_j) \eta^{p-1} Q(I_1, w) + \eta^{p-1} Q(I_1, w) + \eta^p Q(I_1, w) + C_j \eta^{p-1} \left(\eta Q(I_1, w) + Q(I_1, w) \right) \end{aligned} \tag{5.13}$$

since, by choosing A large enough and by construction of $\tilde{g}$ we have

$$(\tilde{g} - g_j)(\|u\|_{L_t^\infty \tilde{H}^2(I_1)}) \quad = 0 \tag{5.14}$$

Therefore we conclude from a continuity argument that $Q(I_i, w) = 0$ and $u = u_{[1]}$ on I_1. In particular $u(b_1) = u_{[j]}(b_1)$. By iteration on i, it is not difficult to see that $u = u_{[1]}$ on $[-t, t]$. Therefore $(\bar{t} - \alpha, \bar{t} + \alpha) \cap [0, j] \subset F_j$, by (5.7).

Therefore, $F_j = [-j, j]$ and we have $\|u\|_{S([-T_0, T_0])} \leq C_j$. This proves global well-posedness. Moreover, since j depends in T_0 and $\|(u_0, u_1)\|_{\tilde{H}^2 \times \tilde{H}^1}$, we get (1.17).

5.1. **Proof of Lemma 4.** In this subsection we prove Lemma 4. We establish *a priori* bounds.

- *Step 1*: We construct g_1. g_1 is basically a nonnegative function that increases and is equal to two for x large. Recall that $[-T,T] \subset [-1,1]$ and $\|(u_0,\, u_1)\|_{\tilde{H}^2 \times \tilde{H}^1} \leq 1$. Let $I \subset [-T,T]$.

  Observe that the point $(\infty-, 3+) := \left(\frac{3+\epsilon}{\epsilon}, 3+\epsilon\right)$ with $\epsilon << 1$ is $\frac{1}{2}$- wave admissible.

  Remark 5.1. *We would like to chop an interval I such that $\|.\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^3(I)} < \infty$ into subintervals I_j such that $\|.\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^3(I_j)}$ is as small as wanted. Unfortunately this is impossible because the L_t^∞ norm is pathologic. Instead we will apply this process to $\|.\|_{L_t^{\infty-} L_x^{3+}}$. This creates slight variations almost everywhere in the process of the construction of g_i. Details with respect to these slight perturbations have been omitted for the sake of readability: they are left to the reader, who should ignore the $+$ and $-$ signs at the first reading.*

  We define

$$X(I) := D^{\frac{1}{2}-s_p} L_t^{\infty-} L_x^{3+}(I) \cap D^{\frac{1}{2}-s_p} W(I) \cap S(I) \cap L_t^\infty \dot{H}^{s_p}(I) \times L_t^\infty \dot{H}^{s_p-1}(I) \tag{5.15}$$

  Let g_1 be a smooth function, defined on the set of nonnegative real numbers nondecreasing and such that $h_1 := g_1 - 2$ satisfies the following properties: $h_1(0) = -1$, h is non decreasing and $h_1(x) = 0$ if $|x| \geq 1$. It is not difficult to see that (1.2) and (1.10) are satisfied.

  Observe that

$$|h_1(x)| \lesssim \frac{1}{|x|^{\frac{p-1}{2}-}} \tag{5.16}$$

  and

$$|h_1'(x)| \lesssim \frac{1}{|x|^{\frac{p+1}{2}-}} \tag{5.17}$$

  Let $u_{[1]}$ and $v_{[1]}$ be solutions of the equations

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \partial_{tt} u_{[1]} - \triangle u_{[1]} & = -\left|u_{[1]}\right|^{p-1} u_{[1]} g_1\left(\left|u_{[1]}\right|\right) \\ u_{[1]}(0) & = u_0 \in \tilde{H}^2 \\ \partial_t u_{[1]}(0) & = u_1 \in \tilde{H}^1 \end{array} \right. \tag{5.18}$$

  and

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \partial_{tt} v_{[1]} - \triangle v_{[1]} & = -2\left|v_{[1]}\right|^{p-1} v_{[1]} \\ v_{[1]}(0) & = u_0 \\ \partial_t v_{[1]}(0) & = u_1 \end{array} \right. \tag{5.19}$$

  There are several substeps

  - *Substep1*: We claim that $\|v_{[1]}\|_{X(\mathbb{R})} < \infty$. Indeed, since we assumed that Conjecture 1 is true, we first divide $\mathbb{R}$ into subintervals $(I_j = [t_j, t_{j+1}])_{1 \leq j \leq l}$ such that $\|v_{[1]}\|_{S(I_j)} = \eta$ and $\|v_{[1]}\|_{S(I_l)} \leq \eta$ with $\eta << 1$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|v_{[1]}\|_{X(I_{j+1})} & \lesssim \|(v_{[1]}(t_j),\partial_t v_{[1]}(t_j))\|_{\dot{H}^{s_p}(\mathbb{R}^3)\times \dot{H}^{s_p-1}(\mathbb{R}^3)} + \|D^{s_p-\frac{1}{2}}(|v_{[1]}|^{p-1}v_{[1]})\|_{\tilde{W}(I_{j+1})} \\ & \lesssim \|(v_{[1]}(t_j),\partial_t v_{[1]}(t_j))\|_{\dot{H}^{s_p}(\mathbb{R}^3)\times \dot{H}^{s_p-1}(\mathbb{R}^3)} + \|D^{s_p-\frac{1}{2}} v_{[1]}\|_{W(I_{j+1})} \|v_{[1]}\|^{p-1}_{S(I_{j+1})} \\ & \lesssim \|v_{[1]}\|_{X(I_j)} + \eta^{p-1}\|v_{[1]}\|_{X(I_{j+1})}\end{aligned} \tag{5.20}$$

Notice that $l \lesssim 1$: this follows from Conjecture 1, Condition 1.1 and the inequality

$$\begin{aligned}\|(u_0,u_1)\|_{\dot{H}^{s_p}(\mathbb{R}^3)\times \dot{H}^{s_p-1}(\mathbb{R}^3)} & \leq \sup_{t\in I_{max,g_1}} \|(u(t),\partial_t u(t))\|_{\dot{H}^{s_p}(\mathbb{R}^3)\times \dot{H}^{s_p-1}(\mathbb{R}^3)} \\ & \leq C_2\left(\|(u_0,u_1)\|_{\tilde{H}^2\times \tilde{H}^1}\right) \\ & \lesssim 1\end{aligned} \tag{5.21}$$

,following from Condition 1.1 and the assumption $\|(u_0,u_1)\|_{\tilde{H}^2\times\tilde{H}^1} \leq 1$ [4]. Therefore, by a standard continuity argument and iteration on j we have

$$\|v_{[1]}\|_{X(\mathbb{R})} \lesssim 1 \tag{5.22}$$

- *Substep 2*: we control $\|u_{[1]}-v_{[1]}\|_{X([-\tilde{t},\tilde{t}])}$ for $\tilde{t} << 1$ to be chosen later. By time reversal symmetry it is enough to control $\|u_{[1]}-v_{[1]}\|_{X([0,\tilde{t}])}$. To this end we consider $w_{[1]} := u_{[1]} - v_{[1]}$. We get

$$\partial_{tt} w_{[1]} - \triangle w_{[1]} = \; -|w_{[1]}+v_{[1]}|^{p-1}(v_{[1]}+w_{[1]})g_1(v_{[1]}+w_{[1]}) + 2|v_{[1]}|^{p-1}v_{[1]} \tag{5.23}$$

Let $\eta^{'} << 1$. By (5.22), we can divide $[0,\tilde{t}]$ into subintervals $(J_k)_{1\leq k\leq m}$ that satisfy the following properties

1. $\|D^{s_p-\frac{1}{2}}v_{[1]}\|_{L_t^{\infty-}L_x^{3+}(J_k)} = \eta^{'}$ or $\|D^{s_p-\frac{1}{2}}v_{[1]}\|_{W(J_k)} = \eta^{'}$ for $1 \leq k < m$
2. $\|D^{s_p-\frac{1}{2}}v_{[1]}\|_{W(J_k)} \leq \eta^{'}$ and $\|D^{s_p-\frac{1}{2}}v_{[1]}\|_{L_t^{\infty-}L_x^{3+}(J_k)} \leq \eta^{'}$ for $1 \leq k \leq m$

We have

$$\begin{aligned}\|w_{[1]}\|_{X(J_{k+1})} & \lesssim \|(w_{[1]}(t_k),\partial_t w_{[1]}(t_k)\|_{\dot{H}^{s_p}(\mathbb{R}^3)\times \dot{H}^{s_p-1}(\mathbb{R}^3)} \\ & + \|D^{s_p-\frac{1}{2}}(2|v_{[1]}|^{p-1}v_{[1]} - 2|v_{[1]}+w_{[1]}|^{p-1}(v_{[1]}+w_{[1]}))\|_{\tilde{W}(J_{k+1})} \\ & + \|D^{s_p-\frac{1}{2}}(h_1(|v_{[1]}+w_{[1]}|)|v_{[1]}+w_{[1]}|^{p-1}(v_{[1]}+w_{[1]})\|_{L_t^1 L_x^{\frac{3}{2}}(J_{k+1})}\end{aligned} \tag{5.24}$$

Let

$$\begin{aligned} A_1 & := \|D^{s_p-\frac{1}{2}}(2|v_{[1]}|^{p-1}v_{[1]} - 2|v_{[1]}+w_{[1]}|^{p-1}(v_{[1]}+w_{[1]}))\|_{\tilde{W}(J_{k+1})} \\ A_2 & := \|D^{s_p-\frac{1}{2}}(h_1(|v_{[1]}+w_{[1]}|)|v_{[1]}+w_{[1]}|^{p-1}(v_{[1]}+w_{[1]})\|_{L_t^1 L_x^{\frac{3}{2}}(J_{k+1})}\end{aligned} \tag{5.25}$$

---

[4] Notice that, at this stage, we only need to know that $\|(u_0,u_1)\|_{\dot{H}^{s_p}(\mathbb{R}^3)\times\dot{H}^{s_p-1}(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq \|(u_0,u_1)\|_{\tilde{H}^2\times\tilde{H}^1} \leq 1$ and apply Conjecture 1. Therefore the introduction of $\sup_{t\in I_{max,g_1}}\|(u(t),\partial_t u(t))\|_{\dot{H}^{s_p}(\mathbb{R}^3)\times\dot{H}^{s_p-1}(\mathbb{R}^3)}$ in (5.21) in redundant. This is done on purpose. Indeed, we will use Condition 1.1 in other parts of the argument: see (5.33)

By the fractional Leibnitz rule applied to $q(x) := |x|^{p-1}xh(x)$, (5.16), (5.17), Sobolev embedding and Hölder in time we have

$$\begin{aligned} A_2 &\lesssim \left\| |v_{[1]} + w_{[1]}|^{\frac{p-1}{2}+} \right\|_{L_t^{1+} L_x^{3-}(J_{k+1})} \| D^{s_p - \frac{1}{2}} (v_{[1]} + w_{[1]}) \|_{L_t^{\infty-} L_x^{3+}(J_{k+1})} \\ &\lesssim \| v_{[1]} + w_{[1]} \|^{\frac{p-1}{2}+}_{L_t^{\frac{p-1}{2}+} L_x^{\frac{3(p-1)+}{2}}(J_{k+1})} \| D^{s_p - \frac{1}{2}} (v_{[1]} + w_{[1]}) \|_{L_t^{\infty-} L_x^{3+}(J_{k+1})} \\ &\lesssim \tilde{t} \| D^{s_p - \frac{1}{2}} (v_{[1]} + w_{[1]}) \|^{\frac{p+1}{2}+}_{L_t^{\infty-} L_x^{3+}(J_{k+1})} \\ &\lesssim \tilde{t} \eta^{\frac{p+1}{2}+} + \tilde{t} \| D^{s_p - \frac{1}{2}} w_{[1]} \|^{\frac{p+1}{2}+}_{L_t^{\infty-} L_x^{3+}(J_{k+1})} \\ &\lesssim \tilde{t} \eta^{\frac{p+1}{2}+} + \tilde{t} \| w_{[1]} \|^{\frac{p+1}{2}+}_{X(J_{k+1})} \end{aligned} \tag{5.26}$$

As for A_1 we follow [11],p 9

$$\begin{aligned} A_1 &\lesssim \left(\| v_{[1]} \|^{p-1}_{S(J_{k+1})} + \| w_{[1]} \|^{p-1}_{S(J_{k+1})} \right) \| D^{s_p - \frac{1}{2}} w_{[1]} \|_{W(J_{k+1})} + \left(\| v_{[1]} \|^{p-2}_{S(J_{k+1})} + \| w_{[1]} \|^{p-2}_{S(J_{k+1})} \right) \\ &\quad \left(\| D^{s_p - \frac{1}{2}} v_{[1]} \|_{W(J_{k+1})} + \| D^{s_p - \frac{1}{2}} w_{[1]} \|_{W(J_{k+1})} \right) \| w_{[1]} \|_{S(J_{k+1})} \\ &\lesssim \eta^{p-1} \| w_{[1]} \|_{X(J_{k+1})} + \| w_{[1]} \|^{p}_{X(J_{k+1})} + \eta^{p-2} \| w_{[1]} \|^{2}_{X(J_{k+1})} + \eta \| w_{[1]} \|^{p-1}_{X(J_{k+1})} \end{aligned} \tag{5.27}$$

This follows from (1.31) and (1.27). Therefore we have

$$\begin{aligned} \| w_{[1]} \|_{X(J_{k+1})} &\lesssim \| w_{[1]} \|_{X(J_k)} + \eta^{\frac{p+1}{2}+} \tilde{t} + \tilde{t} \| w_{[1]} \|^{\frac{p+1}{2}+}_{X(J_{k+1})} + \eta^{p-1} \| w_{[1]} \|_{X(J_{k+1})} + \| w_{[1]} \|^{p}_{X(J_{k+1})} \\ &\quad + \eta^{p-2} \| w_{[1]} \|^{2}_{Y(J_{k+1})} + \eta \| w_{[1]} \|^{p-1}_{X(J_{k+1})} \end{aligned} \tag{5.28}$$

Let C be the constant determined by (5.28). By induction, we have

$$\| w_{[1]} \|_{X(J_k)} \quad \leq (2C)^k \tilde{t} \tag{5.29}$$

provided that for $1 \leq k \leq m-1$ we have

$$\begin{array}{ll} C \eta^{\frac{p+1}{2}} \tilde{t} & << C (2C)^k \tilde{t} \\ C \tilde{t} \left((2C)^k \tilde{t} \right)^{\frac{p+1}{2}+} & << (2C)^k \tilde{t} \\ C \eta^{p-1} (2C)^{k+1} \tilde{t} & << C (2C)^k \tilde{t} \\ C \left((2C)^k \tilde{t} \right)^p & << C (2C)^k \tilde{t} \\ C \eta^{p-2} \left((2C)^{k+1} \tilde{t} \right)^2 & << C (2C)^k \tilde{t} \\ \eta \left((2C)^{k+1} \tilde{t} \right)^{p-1} & << C (2C)^k \tilde{t} \end{array} \tag{5.30}$$

These inequalities are satisfied if $\eta << 1$ and

$$\tilde{t} \quad << 1 \tag{5.31}$$

since $k \leq m-1$ and, by (5.22), $m \lesssim 1$. We conclude that

$$\| w_{[1]} \|_{X([0,\tilde{t}])} \quad \lesssim 1 \tag{5.32}$$

- *Substep 3*: we control $\|u_{[1]}\|_{X([-T,T])}$. By time reversal symmetry, it is enough to control $\|u_{[1]}\|_{X([0,T])}$. Recall that $T \leq 1$. We chop $T \leq 1$ into subintervals $(J_{k'} = [a_{k'}, b_{k'}])_{1 \leq k' \leq l'}$ such that $|J_{k'}| = \tilde{t}$ for $1 \leq k^{'} < l^{'}$ and $|J_{l'}| \leq \tilde{t}$. Notice that, by Condition 1.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|(u(a_{k'}), \partial_t u(a_{k'}))\|_{\dot{H}^{s_p}(\mathbb{R}^3) \times \dot{H}^{s_p-1}(\mathbb{R}^3)} & \leq \sup_{t \in I_{max,g_1}} \|(u(t), \partial_t u(t))\|_{\dot{H}^{s_p}(\mathbb{R}^3) \times \dot{H}^{s_p-1}(\mathbb{R}^3)} \\ & \leq C_2 \left(\|(u_0, u_1)\|_{\tilde{H}^2 \times \tilde{H}^1} \right) \\ & \lesssim 1 \end{aligned} \tag{5.33}$$

,taking advantage of the assumption $\|(u_0, u_1)\|_{\tilde{H}^2 \times \tilde{H}^1} \leq 1$. For each $k^{'}$ we define $v_{[1,k']}$ to be the solution of [5]

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \partial_{tt} v_{[1,k']} - \triangle v_{[1,k']} & = -|v_{[1,k']}|^{p-1} v_{[1,k']} \\ v_{[1,k']}(a_{k'}) & = u_{[1]}(a_{k'}) \\ \partial_t v_{[1,k']}(a_{k'}) & = \partial_t u_{[1]}(a_{k'}) \end{array} \right. \tag{5.34}$$

By slightly modifying the proof of the previous step and letting $v_{[1,k']}$ play the role of $v_{[1]}$ (see previous step), this leads, by (5.33), to

$$\|v_{[1,k']}\|_{X(\mathbb{R})} \lesssim 1 \tag{5.35}$$

and

$$\|w_{[1,k']}\|_{X(J_{k'})} \lesssim 1 \tag{5.36}$$

with $w_{[1,k']} := u_{[1]} - v_{[1,k']}$. Therefore $\|u_{[1]}\|_{X(J_{k'})} \lesssim 1$ and summing over the $J_{k'}$ s we have

$$\|u_{[1]}\|_{X([0,T])} \lesssim 1 \tag{5.37}$$

Substep 4: we control $\|(u_{[1]}, \partial_t u_{[1]})\|_{L_t^\infty \tilde{H}^2([-1,1]) \times L_t^\infty \tilde{H}^1([-1,1])}$ and $\|u_{[1]}\|_{S([-1,1])}$. We get from (5.37)

$$\|u_{[1]}\|_{S([-1,1])} \lesssim 1 \tag{5.38}$$

By Proposition 2 and (5.38) we have

$$\|(u_{[1]}, \partial_t u_{[1]})\|_{L_t^\infty \tilde{H}^2([-1,1]) \times L_t^\infty \tilde{H}^1([-1,1])} \lesssim 1 \tag{5.39}$$

Therefore

$$\max \left(\|u_{[1]}\|_{S([-1,1])}, \, \|(u_{[1]}, \partial_t u_{[1]})\|_{L_t^\infty \tilde{H}^2([-1,1]) \times L_t^\infty \tilde{H}^1([-1,1])} \right) \lesssim 1 \tag{5.40}$$

We let $C_1^{'}$ (defined in the statement of Lemma 4) be equal to one. We can assume without the loss of generality that the constant determined by $\lesssim$ in (5.40) is larger than 1. We let C_1 (defined in the statement of Lemma 4) be equal to this constant. $C_1^{'}$ and C_1 satisfy (5.2) and (5.3).

---

[5] in particular $v_{[1,k']} = v_{[1]}$

Step 2: construction of g_i from g_{i-1}

Recall that $[-T,T] \subset [-i,i]$ and $\|(u_0,u_1)\|_{\tilde{H}^2 \times \tilde{H}^1} \leq i$. From (5.5) it is enough to construct g_i for $|x| > AC_{i-1}$. It is clear that, by choosing $C_i^{'}$ large enough, we can construct find a function $\tilde{g}_i$ defined on $[AC_{i-1}, C_i^{'}]$ such that g_i, defined by

$$g_i(x) \quad := \left\{ \begin{array}{l} g_{i-1}(x), \, |x| \leq AC_{i-1} \\ \tilde{g}_i(x), \, C_i^{'} \geq |x| \geq AC_{i-1} \\ i+1, \, |x| \geq C_i^{'} \end{array} \right. \tag{5.41}$$

is smooth, slowly increasing; it satisfies (1.2), (1.10), and

$$\int_{AC_{i-1}}^{C_i^{'}} \frac{1}{y g_i^2(y)} \, dy \quad \geq i \tag{5.42}$$

It remains to determine C_i (defined in the statement of Lemma 4). To do that we slightly modify the step 1.

We sketch the argument. Let $h_i(x) := g_i(x) - (i+1)$. Then $h_i(x) = 0$ if $|x| > C_i^{'}$. It is not difficult to see that

$$|h_i(x)| \quad \lesssim_i \frac{1}{|x|^{\frac{p-1}{2}+}} \tag{5.43}$$

$$|h_i^{'}(x)| \quad \lesssim_i \frac{1}{|x|^{\frac{p+1}{2}+}} \tag{5.44}$$

Let $u_{[i]}$ and $v_{[i]}$ be the solutions of the equations

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \partial_{tt} u_{[i]} - \triangle u_{[i]} & = -|u_{[i]}|^{p-1} u_{[i]} g_i(|u_{[i]}|) \\ u_{[i]}(0) & := u_0 \\ \partial_t u_{[i]}(0) & := u_1 \end{array} \right. \tag{5.45}$$

and

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \partial_{tt} v_{[i]} - \triangle v_{[i]} & = -(i+1)|v_{[i]}|^{p-1} v_{[i]} \\ v_{[i]}(0) & := u_0 \\ \partial_t v_{[i]}(0) & := u_1 \end{array} \right. \tag{5.46}$$

We have

- *Substep 1*: we have

$$\|v_{[i]}\|_{X(\mathbb{R})} \quad \lesssim_i 1 \tag{5.47}$$

  , by adapting the proof of Substep 1, Step 2. Notice, in particular, that we can use Conjecture 1 and control $\|v_{[i]}\|_{S(\mathbb{R})}$ since $w_{[i]} := (i+1)^{\frac{1}{p-1}} v_{[i]}$ satisfies $\partial_{tt} w_{[i]} - \triangle w_{[i]} = -|w_{[i]}|^{p-1} w_{[i]}$.
- *Substep 2*: we have $\|u_{[i]} - v_{[i]}\|_{X([0,\tilde{t}])} \lesssim_i 1$ for $\tilde{t} <<_i 1$, by adapting the proof of Substep 2, Step 2. The dependance on i basically comes from (5.43), (5.44) and (5.46).

- *Substep 3*: we prove that $\|u_{[i]}\|_{X([-T,T])} \lesssim_{i,p} 1$. By time reversal symmetry, it is enough control $\|u_{[i]}\|_{X([0,T])}$. Recall that $T \leq i$. We chop $[0,T]$ into subintervals $(J_{k'} = [a_{k'}, b_{k'}])_{1 \leq k' \leq l'}$ such that $|J_{k'}| = \tilde{t}$ for $1 \leq k^{'} < l^{'}$ and $|J_{l'}| \leq \tilde{t}$ (with $\tilde{t}$ defined in Substep 2). By Condition 1.1 and the assumption $\|(u_0,u_1)\|_{\tilde{H}^2 \times \tilde{H}^1} \leq i$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|(u_{[i]}(a_{k'}), \partial_t u_{[i]}(a_{k'}))\|_{\dot{H}^{s_p}(\mathbb{R}^3)\times \dot{H}^{s_p-1}(\mathbb{R}^3)} & \leq \sup_{t \in I_{\max,g_i}} \left\|(u_{[i]}(t),\, \partial_t u_{[i]}(t))\right\|_{\dot{H}^{s_p}(\mathbb{R}^3)\times \dot{H}^{s_p-1}(\mathbb{R}^3)} \\ & \lesssim_i 1 \end{aligned} \tag{5.48}$$

We introduce

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \partial_{tt} v_{[i,k']} - \triangle v_{[i,k']} & = -(i+1)|v_{[i,k']}|^{p-1} v_{[i,k']} \\ v_{[i,k']}(a_{k'}) & = u_{[i]}(a_{k'}) \\ \partial_t v_{[i,k']}(a_{k'}) & = \partial_t u_{[i]}(a_{k'}) \end{array} \right. \tag{5.49}$$

and, by using (5.48), we can prove

$$\|u_{[i]}\|_{S([-i,i])} \quad \lesssim_i 1 \tag{5.50}$$

Substep 4. By using Proposition 2 and (5.50) we get

$$\max\left(\|u_{[i]}\|_{S([-i,i])},\, \|(u_{[i]}, \partial_t u_{[i]})\|_{L_t^{\infty}\tilde{H}^2([-i,i]) \times L_t^{\infty}\tilde{H}^1([-i,i])} \right) \quad \lesssim_i 1 \tag{5.51}$$

We can assume without loss of generality that the constant determined by $\lesssim$ in (5.51) is larger than i and $C_i^{'}$. We let C_i be equal to this constant. (5.2) and (5.3) are satisfied.

This ends the proof.

References

[1] H. Bahouri, P. Gerard, *High frequency approximation of solutions to critical nonlinear wave equations*, Amer. J. Mat 121 (1999),131-175

[2] J. Bourgain, *Refinement of Strichartz inequality and applications to $2D - NLS$ with critical nonlinearity*, Internat. Math. Res. Notices, 5 (1998), 253-283

[3] J. Bourgain, *Global solutions of nonlinear Schrödinger equations*, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1999

[4] M. Christ, M.Weinstein, *Dispersion of small amplitude solutions of the generalized Korteweg-de Vries equation*, J. Funct. Anal, 100 (1991), 87-109

[5] J.Colliander, M.Keel, G.Staffilani, H.Takaoka, T.Tao, *Almost conservation laws and global rough solutions to a nonlinear Schrödinger equation*, Math. Res. Letters 9 (2002), pp. 659-682

[6] J. Ginebre, G. Velo, *Generalized Strichartz inequalities for the wave equation*, Journ. Func. Anal., 133 (1995), 50-68

[7] M. Grillakis, *Regularity and asymptotic behaviour of the wave equation with a critical nonlinearity*, Ann. of Math. 132 (1990), 485-509

[8] M. Grillakis, *Regularity for the wave equation with a critical nonlinearity*, Commun. Pure Appl. Math. 45 (1992), 749-774

[9] L. Kapitanski, *Global and unique weak solutions of nonlinear wave equations*, Math. Res. Letters 1 (1994), 211-223

[10] M. Keel and T. Tao, *Endpoint Strichartz estimates*, Amer. J. Math, 120 (1998), 955-980

[11] C.Kenig and F.Merle, *Nondispersive Radial Solutions To Energy Supercritical Non-Linear Wave Equations, With Applications*, preprint, 2008

[12] C. Kenig and F.Merle, *Global well-posedness, scattering, and blow-up for the energy-critical focusing, nonlinear Schrdinger equation in the radial case*, Invent. Math. (2006), 166(3):645675

[13] C.Kenig, G. Ponce and L.Vega, *Well-posedness And Scattering Results For The Generalized Korteweg-de Vries Equation Via The Contraction Principle*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math, 46(4):527-620, 1993

[14] C. E. Kenig, G. Ponce and L. Vega, *Global well-posedness for semi-linear wave equations*, Communications in partial differential equations 25 (2000), pp. 1741-1752

[15] R.Killip and M.Visan, *Energy-supercritical NLS: critical $\dot{H}^s$-bounds imply scattering*,preprint, 2008

[16] H. Lindblad, C. D Sogge, *On Existence And Scattering With Minimal Regularity For Semilinear Wave Equations*, J. Func.Anal 219 (1995), 227-252

[17] J. Rauch, *The u^5-Klein-Gordon equation*, Nonlinear partial differential equations and their applications (H. Brezis and J. L Lions, eds), Pitman, Boston, 1982, pp 335-364

[18] T.Roy, *Global Existence Of Smooth Solutions Of A 3D Loglog energy-supercritical Wave Equation*, preprint, 2008

[19] T.Roy, *Adapted Linear-Nonlinear Decomposition and Global well-posedness for solutions to the defocusing cubic wave equation on $\mathbb{R}^3$*, to appear, DCDS-A

[20] J. Shatah, M. Struwe, *Regularity results for nonlinear wave equations*, Annals of Mathematics 138 (1993), 503-518

[21] J. Shatah, M. Struwe, *Well-Posedness in the energy space for semilinear wave equation with critical growth*, Inter. Math. Research Not., 7 (1994), 303-309

[22] C. D Sogge, *Lectures on nonlinear wave equations*, Monographs in Analysis II, International Press, 1995

[23] M. Struwe *Globally regular solutions to the u^5 Klein-Gordon equation*, Ann. Sci. Norm. Sup. Pisa 15 (1988), 495-513

[24] T. Tao, *Spacetime bounds for the energy-critical nonlinear wave equation in three dimensions*, Dynamics of PDE, 3, 2006, 93-110

[25] T.Tao, *Nonlinear dispersive equations. Local and global analysis*, CBMS REgional Conference Series in Mathematics, 106. Published for the Conference Board of the Mathematical Sciences, Washington, DC; by the American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2006.

[26] T.Tao, *Global regularity for a logarithmically supercritical defocusing nonlinear wave equation for spherically symmetry data*, J. Hyperbolic Diff. Eq., 4, 2007, 259-266

[27] X. Zhang, *On the Cauchy problem of 3D energy-critical Schrödinger equations with subcritical perturbations*, Journal of Differential Equations, Volume 230, Issue 2, 2006, 422-445

University of California, Los Angeles
E-mail address: `triroy@math.ucla.edu`